

REMARKS

Claims 8, 9, 16, 17 and 24 have been canceled, and claims 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 have been amended herein. Claims 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in granting a telephone interview on June 15, 2005 to discuss this matter. Attorney Kosakowski and Examiner Chankong discussed the prior art and amending the claims to place the rejected claims in condition for allowance. No agreement was reached.

The Official Action is taken up in order as follows:

1-2. The Examiner's remarks directed toward the Applicant's arguments in the Amendment filed January 10, 2005 have been carefully considered and are deemed to be moot in view of the amendments made herein to claims 7, 14 and 22 - the three independent claims - as discussed hereinafter.

3-13. Claims 7, 9, 10, 12, 14-18 and 20 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 6,101,499 to Ford (hereinafter "Ford").

Claim 7

Claim 7, as amended herein, recites a method that includes the feature of *"manipulating the first address of each device by adding a predetermined number thereto to derive the second address which uniquely identifies each such device in the second network."* It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Ford, or in any other cited prior art, is there

teaching of the quoted feature above from claim 7 of adding a predetermined number to the first address to derive the second address. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7, as amended herein, is allowable and should be passed to issuance.

Claim 9

Claim 9 has been cancelled herein.

Claims 10, 12

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 10 and 12 is moot, since these two claims each depend directly from claim 7, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 14

Claim 14, as amended herein, recites a method that includes the feature of “*each second address is derived by adding a predetermined number to the corresponding first address of each device.*” It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Ford, or in any other cited prior art, is there teaching of the quoted feature above from claim 14 of adding a predetermined number to the first address to derive the second address. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14, as amended herein, is allowable and should be passed to issuance.

Claims 16, 17

Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled herein.

Claims 18, 20

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 18 and 20 is moot, since these two claims each depend directly from claim 14, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

14-17. Claim 8 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Ford and RFC 2462, “IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration” (hereinafter “RFC 2462”).

Claim 8 has been cancelled.

18-21. Claims 11 and 19 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Ford and the MOST Specification Framework Rev. 1.1 [“MOST spec”] (hereinafter “the MOST Specification”).

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since their associated independent claims, claims 7 and 14 respectively, are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

22-25. Claims 13 and 21 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Ford, the MOST Specification and U.S. Patent 6,163,843 to Inoue (hereinafter “Inoue”).

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since their associated independent claims, claims 7 and 14 respectively, are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

26-28. Claim 22 currently stands rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in the MOST Specification and Ford.

Claim 22 as amended herein, recites a method that includes the feature of "*the second address is derived by adding a predetermined number to the corresponding first address.*" It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in the MOST Specification or in Ford, or in any other cited prior art, is there teaching of the quoted feature above from claim 22 of adding a predetermined number to the first address to derive the second address. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 as amended herein, is allowable and should be passed to issuance.

29-34. Claims 23-25 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in the MOST Specification, Ford and Inoue.

Claim 24 has been cancelled herein. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 23 and 25 is moot, since these two claims each depend directly from claim 22 which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 is hereby respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. O'Shea

Reg. No. 35,305

O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.

1500 Main Street, Suite 912

Springfield, MA 01115

(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102